



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/625,137	07/25/2000	Pramod K. Srivastava	8449-123-999	8478
20583	7590	11/18/2003	EXAMINER	
PENNIE AND EDMONDS			YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H	
1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS				
NEW YORK, NY 100362711			1642	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/625,137	Applicant(s) SRIVASTAVA, PRAMOD K.
	Examiner Christopher H Yaen	Art Unit 1642
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --		
<p>THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.</p>		
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
<p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>05 May 2003</u>. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); (c) <input type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. 		
<p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</p>		
<p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>112, 2nd paragraph</u>.</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The a)<input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b)<input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered or b)<input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>		
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-14, 17-23, 64 and 67-76</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved or b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>		
<p>Christopher Yaen Art Unit 1642</p>		

Continuation of 2. NOTE: newly submitted claims 77-79 have not been searched or considered and are marked as "currently amended" or "previously added" all of which are inaccurate statements. These claims were not present in the paper filed 10/8/2002 (paper no. 10) and as such are newly added claims.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are deemed not persuasive to overcome written description rejections of record. The specification does not support the genus of alpha 2 macroglobulin receptor ligand binding domain fragments claimed. There are many ligand binding domains within the multifunctional alpha 2 macroglobulin receptor, all of which have not been characterized or disclosed in the specification. The specification has only defined a specific cluster within alpha 2 macroglobulin receptor that binds HSPs and does not define or disclose the broad genus of any and all ligand binding domains found within alpha 2 macroglobulin. Furthermore, newly submitted claims 77-79 have not been considered or examined on the merits.

A
ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600